



temperature checks. [Id. at 3-4]. Plaintiff has also since filed an “Amended Writ of Prohibition,” which the Court will construe as a motion, in which he seeks an order of the Court enjoining Defendants from “using a forced medical program to keep prisoners on lock up.” [Doc. 74]. Plaintiff claims Defendants “emboldened by this Court’s tacit approval – are now starting [Plaintiff] over again within [the RDU program] against [Plaintiff’s] will.” [Id.].

Plaintiff’s motions will be denied for several reasons. First, this case has been terminated. Filing motions wholly unrelated to the matter at issue in a terminated proceeding is improper and ineffectual. Second, Plaintiff has not demonstrated any right to the relief requested, in any event. “A writ of prohibition is a drastic remedy which should be granted only when the petitioner’s right to the requested relief is undisputable.” In re Whitehead, 3 Fed. App’x 189, 189 (4th Cir. 2001) (citations omitted). “A writ of prohibition should be granted only when the petitioner has no other adequate means of relief ... and may not be used as a substitute for the normal appellate process.” Id. (internal citation omitted). Petitioner’s right to relief here is by no means indisputable. Third, to the extent Plaintiff intends to assert a claim under the Eighth Amendment based on deliberate indifference, he must do so in a separate proceeding.

**ORDER**

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiff's "Emergency Writ of Prohibition and Injunction" [Doc. 73] and Plaintiff's "Amended Writ of Prohibition" [Doc. 74] are hereby **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed: February 10, 2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Martin Reidinger", written over a horizontal line.

Martin Reidinger  
Chief United States District Judge

